

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending. In view of the following, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, he is requested to schedule a teleconference with the Applicant's attorney to further the prosecution of the application.

Rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aucsmith et al. (US 5,940,513)

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method for authorizing an access to a table of address correspondence between a multitask CPU and at least one memory containing several programs, consisting of calculating, on each task change of the CPU, a signature of at least part of the program instruction lines, and checking the conformity of this signature with a signature recorded upon previous execution of the involved program, each signature being associated with a program identifier.

For example, referring, e.g., to FIG. 5 and paragraph 8 of the present application, access is authorized to a table of address correspondence 10 between a multitask CPU 1 and at least one memory 4 containing several programs. On each task change of the CPU 1, a signature CURASID is calculated of at least part of the program instruction lines, and the conformity of this signature CURASID is checked with a signature ASID recorded upon previous execution of the involved program. It should be noted that each of the signatures CURASID and ASID is associated with a program identifier. It should be further noted that the signature ASID is recorded upon a previous execution of the involved program.

Aucsmith, on the other hand, does not disclose the limitations of claim 1. In fact, Aucsmith does not even disclose a multitask CPU or a table of address correspondence. Instead, Aucsmith discloses a signature generator 221 (within encoding unit 210) that creates a signature of a program during the encoding (not executing) of the program (FIG. 2; col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 9). Aucsmith emphasizes

the fact that the signature of the program is created "prior to execution" of the program (col. 5, line 9). Then an access controller unit 106 receives and verifies the signature of the program to be executed in order to identify the origin of the process and verify that the process is not threatening (col. 4, lines 47-61). Again, Aucsmith emphasizes the fact that this happens prior to execution of the program (col. 4, line 51). However, all of this has nothing to do with checking the conformity of a current signature with a signature recorded upon a previous execution of the involved program. The only signature created in Aucsmith is prior to any execution of the program (during encoding), and thus by definition, cannot be recorded upon a previous execution of the program. Furthermore, each signature in Aucsmith is not associated with a program identifier as defined throughout the present application. After reviewing Aucsmith in its entirety, the Applicant's attorney is unable to find any mention of a multitask CPU, a table of address correspondence, signatures each associated with a program identifier, and a signature recorded upon previous execution of the involved program. Therefore, Aucsmith does not satisfy all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 2-3

Claims 2-3 are patentable by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites a processor of multitask execution of several programs, exploiting a table of correspondence, each correspondence being associated with an identifier of the involved program, comprising means for calculating a current signature, and means for comparing this signature with the identifier of the program stored in the correspondence table.

Claim 4 is patentable for reasons similar to those recited above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

Claim 5

Claim 5 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 4.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner determines that additional fees are necessary, he is authorized to charge them to deposit account number 07-1897.

If, after considering this response, the Examiner does not agree that all of the claims are allowable, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner schedule a phone interview with the Applicant's attorney at (425) 455-5575.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



J. Mark Han
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,898
155 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
Phone: (425) 455-5575
Fax: (425) 455-1046